

***Remarks***

Claims 1-4 and 7-36 are being presented for reconsideration, with claims 1, 21, 26, and 35 being the independent claims. Claims 35-36 are sought to be added. Claims 1-4, 7-9, 12, 14-19, 21-27, 32, and 34 are sought to be amended. Claims 5-6 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute similar or broader claims, with respect to the cancelled and amended claims, in the future.

Paragraph 0043 has been amended to update the application number information contained therein.

No new matter has been introduced by any amendments.

Based on the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)***

Claims 1-4, 7, 10, 11, 13, 19-26, and 29-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0019444 to Sicilia et al. (“Sicilia”). Applicants traverse this rejection.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 recites features that distinguish over the applied reference. For example, claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

at least one of said at least two nozzles including nozzle bodies coupled together, said nozzle bodies including at least an upstream nozzle body having an upstream end adjacent said manifold channel and a downstream end, and **a downstream nozzle body having a downstream end adjacent a mold plate and an upstream end adjacent the downstream end of the upstream nozzle body . . .**

Sicilia teaches coupling a first, rear-mounted nozzle (16 or 516) to a second, front-mounted nozzle (42 or 542) using a nozzle link (44 or 544), which is positioned between the first and second nozzles. Thus, Sicilia does not teach or suggest “a downstream nozzle body having an upstream end adjacent the downstream end of the upstream nozzle body,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, Sicilia does not anticipate claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1. Also, at least based on their dependency to claim 1, claims 2-4 and 7-20 should be found allowable over the applied reference.

**Claim 21**

Claim 21 recites features that distinguish over the applied reference. For example, claim 21 recites (emphasis added):

at least one of said at least two nozzles including at least two nozzle bodies, **the at least two nozzle bodies including an upstream nozzle body directly connected in tandem with a downstream nozzle body** via a removably fastened connection, a respective one of the nozzle tips being disposed in a downstream end of said downstream nozzle body....

As discussed above, Sicilia teaches coupling a first, rear-mounted nozzle (16 or 516) to a second, front-mounted nozzle (42 or 542) using a nozzle link (44 or 544) that is positioned between the first and second nozzles. Thus, Sicilia does not teach or suggest “the at least two nozzle bodies including an upstream nozzle body directly connected in tandem with a downstream nozzle body,” as recited in claim 21. Therefore, Sicilia does not anticipate claim 21.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 21. Also, at least based on their dependency to claim 21, claims 22-25 should be found allowable over the applied reference.

**Claim 26**

Claim 26 recites features that distinguish over the applied reference. For example, claim 26 recites:

wherein each of said nozzle bodies includes at least a first heater and a second heater, wherein each of at least said first heater is embedded into each of said nozzle bodies.

Sicilia teaches a single heater (32 or 532) associated with a first nozzle (16 or 516) and a single heater (60 or 560) associated with a second nozzle (42 or 542). Thus, Sicilia does not teach or suggest “each of said nozzle bodies includes at least a first heater and a second heater,” as recited in claim 26. Therefore, Sicilia does not anticipate claim 26.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 26. Also, at least based on their dependency to claim 26, claims 27-34 should be found allowable over the applied reference.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sicilia in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,789,745 to Babin et al. (“Babin”). Claims 12, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sicilia in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,894,025 to Lee et al. (“Lee”). Claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sicilia in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,820,803 to Hashimoto (“Hashimoto”).

None of these applied references, Babin, Lee, or Hashimoto, is being used to teach or suggest, neither do they teach or suggest: (a) “a downstream nozzle body having an upstream end adjacent the downstream end of the upstream nozzle body,” as recited in claim 1; (b) “the at least two nozzle bodies including an upstream nozzle body directly connected in tandem with a downstream nozzle body,” as recited in claim 21; or (c) “each of said nozzle bodies includes at least a first heater and a second heater,” as recited in claim 26. Thus, none of these applied references, Babin, Lee, or Hashimoto, cure the deficiencies of Sicilia. Therefore, the combination of these applied references with

Sicilia does not establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

**New Claims 35-36**

New claim 35 recites a combination of features that are similar to features found in pending claim 1 and now cancelled claim 5, and includes the allowable subject matter from now cancelled claim 5 indicated by the Examiner at page 3 of the Office Action. Therefore, claims 35 and 36 should be found allowable over the applied references.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided. Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Jason D. Eisenberg  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 43,447

Date: 5/5/06

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600 528377.1

Atty. Docket No.: 2107.1090000